

EXHIBIT

B

689ztan1

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----x

3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

4 v.

05 Cr. 621 (KMK)

5 ALBERTO VILAR
6 GARY TANAKA,

Hearing

Defendant.

-----x

7 New York, N.Y.
8 August 9, 2006
9 9:45 a.m.

Before:

10 KENNETH M. KARAS

District Judge

11 MICHAEL J. GARCIA
12 United States Attorney for the
13 Southern District of New York
14 One St. Andrew's Plaza
15 New York, N.Y. 10007
16 DEIRDRE A. McEVOY
17 MARC O. LITT
18 Assistant United States Attorneys

19 JEFFREY C. HOFFMAN, ESQ.
20 Attorneys for Defendant Vilar
21 Hoffman & Pollik, LLP
22 260 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
23 New York, New York 10016
24 (212) 679-2900

25 GLENN C. COLTON, ESQ.
Attorney for Defendant Tanaka
Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati (NYC)
12 East 49th Street, 30th Floor
New York, New York 10017
(212) 999-5804

STEVEN G. KOBRE, ESQ.
Attorney for Defendant Tanaka
Kobre & Kim LLP
800 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022
(212) 488-1200

689ztan3

Litt - cross

1 MS. McEVOY: Objection to the characterization.

2 THE COURT: I mean, what -- I don't understand, are
3 you asking him whether or not what he said at that
4 December 14th conference was the truth?

5 MR. HOFFMAN: Correct.

6 THE COURT: Okay. Was that the truth, Mr. Litt, what
7 you said back then?

8 THE WITNESS: I believe that to be true at the time,
9 yes.

10 THE COURT: Is it still true?

11 THE WITNESS: I need to see the -- all the words.

12 THE COURT: All right, all right. Go ahead,
13 Mr. Hoffman.

14 (Document provided to the witness by Mr. Hoffman)

15 THE COURT: Page eight and page nine, right, Mr.
16 Hoffman?

17 MR. HOFFMAN: Those are the only two pages there.

18 THE COURT: Okay.

19 (Pause while witness reviews document)

20 A. My current recollection, and I testified about this on May
21 31st, my current recollection differs from this in that I now
22 do not believe that I was on the train. I believe the
23 conversation, yes, occurred toward the end of the day. I
24 believe it occurred sometime in the afternoon or early evening
25 but I was not on the train. And I can, if you'd like, go

689ztan3

Litt - cross

1 through everything that Mr. Licker said, which is -- I mean the
2 gravamen of it is in this paragraph.

3 Q. Okay.

4 A. It's slightly different, but I testified to that on May
5 31st.

6 Q. So in answer to the Court's question as to whether the
7 statements made on that date -- I just don't have it in front
8 of me -- were accurate, is that it was accurate other than that
9 you don't believe you're on the train; is that correct?

10 A. It was accurate at the time, and the substance, the
11 gravamen of the conversation, that is, that Mr. Licker got on
12 the phone with me and suggested, and here's what he said; it's
13 been a long day, my people are tired, your people are tired, we
14 want to go home, I have your subpoena, I've agreed -- we've
15 agreed to preserve the documents. I don't really think you
16 want all this stuff anyway, so why don't you stop the search,
17 and we have the subpoena, and we'll proceed that way instead.

18 Q. Okay. And so when you say in this statement on
19 December 14th, 2005 that, in this conversation that occurred
20 late in the day, but you may not have been on the train, that
21 Mr. Licker said, and I think it would be for Amerindo and more
22 efficient for you if you give us the subpoena, is that what you
23 still believe today he said at that time?

24 A. No. And what I said --

25 THE COURT: You weren't sure if he -- whether he

689ztan3

Litt - cross

1 already had the subpoena. You read earlier --

2 MR. HOFFMAN: Yes.

3 THE COURT: -- left whether or not he had the subpoena
4 open.

5 BY MR. HOFFMAN:

6 Q. Is that correct, your statement?

7 A. Well, the words speak for themselves. But what I said
8 right after that was words to the effect of, and I'm not even
9 sure whether or not he already had the subpoena or not.

10 Q. Okay.

11 A. As I sit here today, I believe, quite firmly, that he had
12 the subpoena because it was faxed to him at approximately 1:27
13 and our conversation occurred several hours later.

14 Q. So would it be accurate to say that when you made the
15 statement that we just went over on December 14th, at that
16 time -- my only question is -- you did not know whether or not
17 Mr. Licker was requesting the subpoena in the evening hours?

18 A. Well --

19 MR. COLTON: I'm going to object to that question
20 because it was so vague, that I don't want the record to be --

21 THE COURT: Yeah, I agree, I agree, I agree. It is a
22 vague question.

23 Q. When you stated on December 14th that Mr. Licker either
24 already had the subpoena or may have gotten it earlier in the
25 day --